

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on January 16, 2003. The abstract, specification, and claims have been editorially amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-9 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

In sections 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the abstract was objected to based on length and legal phraseology used therein. The abstract has been amended to be less than 150 words, and all legal phraseology has been removed. Removal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to apparently for lacking headings and also for spelling and referencing the claims. The specification has been amended to add section headings and address the noted informalities. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In sections 5 and 6, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the rejection states that it is unclear how the memory set forth in claim 6, as a control element defined in the specification as reference numeral 8, can be a fixed computer, because the control element 8 is moveable as shown in the drawings. Claim 7 has been amended to address the issues identified by the rejection. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 7 are respectfully requested.

In sections 7 and 8, claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the rejection notes a lack of antecedent basis for limitations in claims 6 and 7. The noted claims have been amended to address the identified informalities. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

In sections 9 and 10 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elkin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,123,174. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for manual lubrication of a plurality of lubrication points. Claim 1 recites that each of the lubrication points are provided with individual identification information on the quantity of lubricant that is to be administered to each individual lubrication point. Claim 1 further recites that each instance of lubrication is stored in a memory, and that, in

the lubrication of a lubrication point, the identification of the point is detected and information on the predetermined quantity of lubricant for the lubrication point identified is retrieved from the memory, following which the quantity of lubricant is administered to the lubrication point, and information on the lubrication carried out and time thereof is stored in the memory.

The configuration recited by claim 1 is advantageous to, for example, provide manual lubrication to a device such as a paper machine that includes a plurality of lubrication points requiring differing amounts of lubricant. See page 1, lines 4-9 of the present application.

In contrast, Elkin discloses an apparatus and method for automatically changing fluids, such as the oil, in a vehicle. See the abstract of Elkin. Therefore, as noted in the rejection, although Elkin may disclose information related to an amount of oil to dispense into a crankcase of a vehicle, Elkin does not suggest a method for manual lubrication of a plurality of lubrication points, as recited by claim 1.

The rejection states that it would have been obvious to modify the single lubrication point disclosed in Elkin with a plurality of lubrication points, since duplication is generally recognized to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. This characterization and assertion are respectfully traversed.

If the method and apparatus disclosed in Elkin were merely duplicated, the result would be the lubrication of a multitude of single lubrication points. Elkin does not disclose or suggest lubrication of a plurality of lubrication points of a car. Therefore, if the disclosure of Elkin were applied to and duplicated with respect to, for example, paper machines, the result would be a plurality of paper machines wherein each paper machine has a single lubrication point lubricated. Such a result would not be desirable, and one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify Elkin in this manner. Therefore, for at least this reason, Elkin cannot be modified by simple duplication to accomplish the method recited by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Elkin fails to render claim 1, as well as claims 2-5 that depend therefrom, obvious. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

In section 11 of the Office Action, claims 6, 8, and 9 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elkin in view of Pollock, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,572. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is directed to a device for manual lubrication of a plurality of lubrication points with a quantity of lubricant individually predetermined for each lubrication point. Pollock does

not remedy the shortcomings noted in Elkin. Therefore, for at least the same reasons expressed above with respect to claim 1, neither Elkin nor Pollock render claim 6 obvious.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 6, as well as claims 8 and 9 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.


Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and remarks. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
Post Office Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Dated: April 16, 2003



By 
John J. Giesens
Reg. No. 33,112
JJG/RAK